THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, APRIL, 1915

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

One hundred and sixteen Branch Committees; 30,610 members in 413 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President
MISS MARY S AMES.
MRS. JOHN BALCH.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
Vice-Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer pro tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y., Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

A DOUBLE CAMPAIGN

The vote of the Massachusetts Legislature to submit to the electors next November the proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution imposes upon the members of the Anti-Suffrage Association the necessity of a double campaign.

This campaign will have for its first object the increase of the membership of the Association; the organization of new branches; the enlargement of those already existing; and a wide-spread canvass for new members. The educational work which has been carried on for the past years must be continued and extended. Anti-suffragists have no inclination and are under no necessity to follow the spectacular methods of the suffragists. Cross-country hikes and horseback parades are not in their line. But in every suitable way, it is their duty this year, more than in any previous year, to make their position known, and to bring into direct affiliation the thousands of Massachusetts women who, although strongly opposed to suffrage, have not hitherto taken an active part in resisting it.

But the second object of the campaign is even more important. This is the bringing home to the voters of the state the real sentiment of the great majority of the women. By the distribution of literature, by public meetings, by the exercise of personal influence and by direct canvass the whole electorate, so far as possible, should be reached. There is no state in the Union where there is less excuse for that sex-antagonism upon which the suffrage movement so largely rests; no state where the laws are more generous and just to women; no state where the attitude of men toward women is more considerate and chivalrous. But, for this very reason there is danger that Massachusetts voters, if not well informed as to the real wishes of the women of the state, might be led by a mistaken sympathy to vote for a proposal which, professing to give them a larger liberty, would actually impose on them a heavy burden.

The real goal of this double campaign,—the object to be kept steadily in view,—is not merely the defeat of the proposed amendment, but its defeat by a majority so overwhelming that no Legislature for many years to come will yield to any suffrage clamor for its resubmission.

This goal can be reached if the women who really desire it will accept as a personal responsibility the doing of everything in their power to win it.

TO MASSACHUSETTS MEN

DO YOU KNOW

That the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association has 30,610 members, in 413 cities, towns and villages, all of them women of voting age, and all strongly opposed to the pending suffrage amendment?

That the Association represents the great majority of Massachusetts women? The suffragists themselves admit that the majority of the women are either actively opposed to suffrage or indifferent to it.

That the proposal to give these women a chance to express their views through a referendum was defeated in the Legislature because of the bitter opposition of the suffragists?

DON'T YOU THINK

That the time-honored principle of the rule of the majority should hold in a matter so fundamental?

That the average woman,—your wife, sister, mother—is busy enough already with natural, congenial and necessary duties, and ought not to be loaded against her will, with political responsibilities?

That, for such leisure as she may have, there are abundant openings for useful activity,—social, charitable, religious—in which politics would be only a hindrance?

That it would be a foolish waste of energy to put women upon men's job,—two to do a work which one can do as well or better?

DON'T BE DECEIVED

The suffragists are plausible, strenuous and energetic. Many of them are sincere. But your best way to HELP MASSACHUSETTS WOMANHOOD is to VOTE AGAINST THE AMENDMENT.

DR. SHAW figures it out that 49½ per cent of the territory of the United States is suffrage territory. That sounds impressive; but it is not territory but people that vote. Would it not have been more candid if Dr. Shaw had said that only 9.3 per cent. of the population of the United States live in full-suffrage territory?

IN SELF-DEFENCE

WHEN women who are opposed to woman suffrage organize to make their opposition effective, and hold meetings and engage in other activities in order to influence public opinion, they are met with the familiar suffrage taunt that they are doing the very things which they condemn in suffragists.

The suffragists say: "You profess to believe that women should keep out of politics, that they have no proper place in public life, and that they should be content with functions and duties that are distinctly womanly. Yet, here you are, leaving your homes and your children to appear before legislators and to speak from public platforms. Where is your consistency?"

The answer is easy. It is in self-defence that anti-suffragists are acting. Public activities of the sort in which they find themselves temporarily compelled to engage are distasteful to them; but they think it better to undertake them for a time if, by so doing, they can avert action which they believe would be disastrous both to women and to the state. They know that, if they do not make their feelings known, their silence will be made political capital for the suffragists, who will claim that they are in sympathy with them. The alternative before them is plain and simple. It is either to divert their activities for a time from congenial and useful work, or to take the risk of being permanently burdened with alien and crippling responsibilities.

There are undoubtedly thousands of Chicago women who voted at the city election last April with extreme reluctance. The ballot had been forced upon them. They had not asked for it. They did not want it. All their instincts were against participation in politics. But, when they found the Secretary of the United Societies predicting that the saloon interests which he represented "would have no difficulty in getting results at the polls"; and when they discovered that Mrs. Blazi, Chicago's "woman boss" had delivered 300 votes for "Bathhouse John," they overcame their reluctance, and registered and voted. They did not succeed. "Bathhouse John" was reelected, and more women voted for him than against him; but the Chicago women who went to the polls against their inclination had their first experience with real politics.

Happily, Massachusetts women do not now confront such a situation. The burdens of the ballot cannot be forced upon them, except by the action of a majority of Massachusetts voters. And these voters will seek to do what they believe a majority of the women of the state wish them to do. It is this which makes it a duty for even the most conservative and retiring of women to take a positive position, and merely in self-defence to resist the suffrage movement.

"NEVER MIND THE FACTS"

DR. ANNA SHAW, in an article in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for November, 1914, said: "Facts as to the results of equal suffrage, or the number of women who want suffrage, or the reason they ought to want it, have no bearing on our question. . . I contend that we should not answer our opponents when they argue along these lines."

Dr. Shaw is to be congratulated. She has framed a platform upon which suffragists can calmly stand. Hitherto they have undoubtedly been a good deal bothered by facts. Facts are said to be stubborn things. When the suffragists have claimed that women voters would secure better laws, and then have been asked to explain why it is that laws in male suffrage states are better than in suffrage states, they have been a good deal embarrassed. They have come into collision with facts, and the result has been painful. When they have insisted that women, as voters, could be counted on to stand solidly for temperance and morality, and their attention has been called to such episodes as women voting overwhelmingly "wet" at Pasadena, or campaigning at street corners for "wet" Sundays at Redondo Beach, they have been perplexed to reconcile the phenomena with their statement. When they have assured women school teachers that their only way to "equal pay for equal work" lay through the ballot, and then have been reminded that, in Colorado,—and this on suffrage authority—the gap between men and women teachers is wider than in male suffrage states, while in New York city, without the ballot, women teachers have secured what they wanted, they have been thrown into confusion, again by collision with hard facts. When they have professed to speak for women as a sex, and comment has been made upon the fact that not more than one woman in thirty is affiliated with their organization, and that only a small minority of women want the ballot, they have found it hard to frame a satisfactory reply.

Now Dr. Shaw comes to their relief. They are not to trouble themselves any more about facts. Anything else will do,—theories, fancies, illusions, dreams, imaginings. But they are not to answer their opponents along the line of facts. It will be a blessed relief to them.

"GONE TO SEED"?

THE chief incident of the New York suffrage campaign thus far is the formal withdrawal of the Women's Political Union, led by Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, from the National Woman Suffrage Association.

Mrs. John Winters Brannan, Treasurer of the Union, in a statement in the New York Evening Post, gives two reasons for this step: First, that the Union wanted to spend all its money in the campaign in New York; Second, "That we all feel that the National Association has practically gone to seed."

"Gone to seed." Well, well! If anti-suffragists had said that, it might have seemed discourteous. But Mrs. Blatch and Mrs. Brannan are in a position to know. The feud among the different factions of suffragists must be serious to lead to an open split at the beginning of the campaign.

THE ISSUE IN MASSACHUSETTS

THE favorable action of the Massachusetts legislature this year upon the proposed suffrage amendment was a foregone conclusion. This does not mean that a majority of the members were in favor of suffrage, but that they were weary of the agitation and thought that the best way to end it was to let the amendment go to the voters and be beaten at the polls.

There was a hearing before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, at which arguments against the amendment were presented by Mr. Robert M. Turner, Mrs. Thomas Allen, Mrs. Henry Preston White, Mrs. William W. Churchill, Mrs. Martha M. Avery, Dr. Ernest Bernbaum, Miss Mary Maguire, and Mr. John A. Murphy; and Mrs. Teresa M. Crowley, Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald, Mr. Henry Sterling and others spoke in favor of the amendment. The committee reported favorably; and the Senate adopted the amendment by a vote of 33 to 3, with one pair, and two members not voting, and the House adopted it by a vote of 196 to 33.

The most significant incident of the session at which the Senate voted was a statement read by Senator Wells of Haverhill, to the effect that there were 26 Senators who had confided to him their intention of voting against the amendment at the polls, and 8 others who were in doubt as to what their vote would be. The real attitude of the Senators therefore, as disclosed by Senator Wells's canvass, the accuracy of which has not been disputed, is 4 in favor of the amendment, 26 opposed and 8 in doubt. It is probable that a similar canvass of the House would show a similar division of sentiment.

This is a chastening fact for the suffragists to bear in mind; and it may well moderate their jubilation over the result. In the community at large, as well as in the legislature, there is an increasing impatience with the methods pursued in the suffrage campaigns, the persistent suffrage misrepresentations of Massachusetts laws and Massachusetts men, and the extreme socialist and feminist ideals represented by the more radical suffrage leaders.

As events have shaped themselves, Massachusetts anti-suffragists are well content to meet the issue, and they look confidently to Massachusetts voters to give so great a majority against the amendment as to settle the question for many years to come.

AFRAID TO LET WOMEN VOTE

THE St. Paul Dispatch says editorially:

"Miss Minnie Bronson, in her address before the women at the Church club Thursday afternoon, put her finger squarely on the weak spot in the armor of the suffragists, when she observed that the majority of women did not want the vote. She went on to say that the American men stood ready to grant women the right, any time the latter demonstrated their desire for it, but that ninety per cent. of the women did not care for the ballot.

This may have been putting it a bit strong, but Miss Bronson offered a definite and we believe a fair challenge to the pros when she said that the antis would withdraw their opposition to suffrage if through a referendum it could be proved that a majority of women were in favor of the ballot. A referendum vote among the women of Minnesota on this moot subject would have a most salutary effect in clearing up the atmosphere, not only for the women themselves, but among the men and particularly the members of the Legislature.

We have no doubt at all that opposition to submitting the question to the people would melt instantly if a fair referendum revealed a desire among a majority of the women for the suffrage. But as long as the conviction prevails in the minds of the men that their better halves do not want the ballot, there will be infinite reluctance to thrust the new responsibility upon them."

What is true of Minnesota is true of all the states in which this question of woman suffrage is pending, directly or remotely. The average man is ready to do what he believes the average woman wants. If he is convinced that the majority of women want the ballot, he will vote to give it to them. But, in the absence of such proof, nothing else will serve,—not the suffragist prancing along the street on horseback, nor her sister "hiking" across country on foot, or haranguing street crowds from soap-boxes. These he regards as exceptional—perhaps the more exceptional the better; it is the wishes of the mass of women about which he seeks information.

And what stands in the way of such a referendum as that for which the St. Paul Dispatch asks,—a referendum which would show conclusively where the great majority of women stand, and what they want? Always and everywhere, it is the suffragists who resist every attempt to give women a chance to express themselves upon this question. They profess to be eager to have women vote, they even profess to believe that voting is a right of which women are unjustly deprived, but they are afraid to have women vote upon the fundamental question whether women shall have the ballot.

Had it not been for this attitude of the suffragists, the men of Massachusetts would not now be approaching the settlement of this question at the polls without any definite knowledge of what the women of Massachusetts want. The Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association went before the Legislature last year with a bill which proposed to give the women of the state a chance to express their views upon suffrage. If this bill had passed, and if a majority of the women of the state had expressed themselves in favor of suffrage, the way would have been open for a speedy victory for the suffrage cause. Opposition would have been abandoned; and the adoption of a suffrage amendment to the constitution would have followed as a matter of course.

The suffragists would scarcely have forfeited so great an advantage as this, if they had believed that they had the ghost of a chance of polling a majority of the women of the state. It was because they knew that they were hopelessly in the minority that they fought the bill. Their motive could not be disguised, and its significance will not be forgotten.

THE PROPOSED FEDERAL AMENDMENT

SOME PRESS COMMENTS

SUFFRAGE SHOULD NOT BE FORCED

(From the Boston Evening Transcript, Dec. 24, 1914)

SUFFRAGE, male or female, is a privilege, not a right. Because it has been extended indiscriminately in the past is poor reason for repeating the mistake in the future. When the women of any state are really ready and willing to assume the responsibilities of suffrage we believe an enlightened public opinion will force the State legislature to give them the vote. Until they obtain the privilege, State by State, that privilege should not be forced upon them by Federal statute.

A VERY MATERIAL DIFFERENCE

(From the Pittsburg Chronicle, Jan. 7, 1915)

A PHILADELPHIA spokeswoman for the suffragists at yesterday's meeting, after listening to Mr. Wilson, replied to him that there was little difference between the Federal Constitutional amendment method and that by amendment of state constitutions, for "ultimately" she said, "the state legislatures had to pass on amendments."

There is a material difference in the methods, as the Philadelphian ought to know. By the Federal amendment method the voters of a commonwealth are made mere lookers-on while the legislatures decide. By the state constitutional method the question is of necessity submitted to popular vote. If, as expected, the Pennsylvania legislature now in session submits to the people the pending woman suffrage amendment, the people, that is to say, the qualified voters, will exercise a sovereign function which is denied them in the processes of amending the Constitution of the United States. They and not merely the legislature will decide. Not a small difference, by any means.

PARTICULARLY HATEFUL AND ILL-ADVISED

(From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 3, 1915)

THE advocates of woman's suffrage seem determined to force the adoption of their fad upon all the states whether desired by the people of those states or not. There is certainly no Northern state, and possibly no state, in which the suffrage will not be granted to women if a majority of them will ask it. In this and other states the franchise has been given without waiting for the request of a majority of the sex, and, as the event has shown, without the desire of a majority. It is more than probable that were the question of the withdrawal of the right submitted to vote in this state, with the women voting, the right would be withdrawn. There are multitudes of women who would register for such an election for the sole purpose of getting rid of a duty which they detest, and whose obligations they refuse to fulfil.

The action of the women coercionists who are insisting on urging a Constitutional amendment which would impose suffrage on states whose people do not want it is not only particularly hateful, but from their own standpoint very ill advised.

WEARY YEARS AHEAD

(From the Cincinnati Inquirer, Jan. 13, 1915)

VICTORIES in sparsely-settled Western states can scarcely be taken as omens of what is going to happen in the great commonwealths of the East. The doctrine of universal suffrage appears to be much more popular in rural than in urban communities. With single cities in many of the Eastern States with more voters than the entire population of Western States that have adopted woman suffrage, it seems likely that the conquest of the Middle West and Eastern States will be attended with weary years of waiting and struggling.

THE GROWING SENTIMENT AGAINST SUFFRAGE

(From the Waterbury, Conn., American, Jan. 13, 1915)

EVEN men who do not disapprove of woman suffrage, if the women want it, are affected by the growing strength of that body of feminine sentiment which is opposed to granting the vote to women, or to what, from their point of view, is forcing it upon them. Evidently the suffrage hosts have a longer road to go than they thought they had a little while ago.

NOT A PROMISING OUTLOOK

(From the Troy, N. Y., Times, Jan. 13, 1915)

WOMAN suffrage now comes back to the states, to be fought over there. The outlook is not promising for the change. At the last election five states out of seven voted against woman suffrage, and the five states vastly outnumbered in population the other two . . . . There are indications that there has been a recession of the trend of sentiment in favor of woman suffrage. The natural conservatism of the people is reasserting itself, and the rush to try new experiments has fallen off. The doctrine that everything which is new must therefore be right has received some hard jolts, and the result has been felt by woman suffrage as well as by other agitations.

A SUGGESTION OF SUFFRAGETTISM

(From the Pawtucket, R. I. Times, Jan. 8, 1915)

WHY do the suffragists persist in coming to Mr. Wilson, to argue with him about a Federal amendment? The ground the President takes is sound, and is approved by many thinkers. It is inconceivable that Mr. Wilson will change unless he is authorized to do so by the next Democratic platform, and that is wildly improbable. These frequent visits to the White House are approaching the general character of suffragettism, which is something our ambitious women would better avoid.

NO REFORMS THROUGH WOMEN'S BALLOTS

(From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 17, 1915)

IN any event, the proposed amendment was killed, and no doubt it will be killed again if it is brought before the next Congress, for the President will be in the seat of power during its term of two years and his opinion will continue to hold. Gradually the women are coming into their votes in the West, but it has yet to be shown that they are accomplishing any particular reforms through their ballots. Meanwhile the opposition of women to the franchise is maintained in increasing strength in the East. Doubtless the Pennsylvania Legislature will agree to permit the question of woman's suffrage in this State to be passed upon by a popular vote, and doubtless, too, that vote will be adverse.

ACCORDING to Mrs. Jacobs, President of the Alabama Equal Suffrage Association, the Prohibitionists "blocked" the suffrage bill in that State. But how about Prohibition and Woman Suffrage going "hand in hand"? Does it not look as if the suffragists had carried their policy of conciliating the liquor interests a little too far?

INSTRUCTIONS FROM HOME

SUFFRAGISTS who exult over the fact that nearly all the Representatives in Congress from suffrage states voted in the House, on the 12th of January, in favor of the proposed Federal amendment, should not be disturbed because Representatives from states which have recently rejected suffrage amendments voted against the proposal. Several of them were quite candid in giving their reasons.

Mr. Stafford of Wisconsin said:

"In Wisconsin we have had woman suffrage submitted to a vote of the people. Only 14 out of 71 counties registered their approval of it. Fifty seven had clear majorities, many of them twice and a few three times as many against it. A total majority of more than 70,000 against it. There is no objection to Illinois saying that they should have woman suffrage, and if perchance Wisconsin or any other state through its men and women are opposed to having woman suffrage, why impose it upon us who believe it is not well for the polity of the State to extend the franchise?"

Mr. Gordon of Ohio took the same view. He said:

"The people of my State rejected woman suffrage by 182,000 last fall. Do you think that they are demanding that we force it upon them by Federal act?"

And Mr. Sloan of Nebraska said:

"If no recent deliverance had been made by the people of the State or my district on the subject, my course would be largely governed by whether or not, in my judgment, a very large percentage of the people of the district and State desired a right to express themselves on the subject; but in this their expression is not a matter of estimate but one of established fact. I feel it would not be my duty to vote to submit the question to the 48 States, which would give 36 States an opportunity to force upon my own State a measure which it has so recently rejected."

Mr. Carter of Oklahoma took the same view of the question. He expressed his dissent thus:

"The State of Oklahoma has gone on record against woman suffrage by a state-wide vote of nearly two to one; and until the ladies of my home state give some adverse expression, I shall certainly consider this action as binding instructions on me."

But the most striking expression was that of Mr. Lenroot of Wisconsin who, although himself a believer in woman suffrage, said:

"At the last election, it was submitted in seven states, and defeated in five states. What are we to gather from that action? That there is a well-settled public demand for an amendment to the Federal Constitution in this respect? I ask you, sir, is not such public opinion as has been expressed directly to the contrary?—I am sorry that that condition prevails, because I believe in woman suffrage."

All these declarations rest back upon the belief that it is the prime function of a Representative, as the title itself suggests, to represent his constituents; and that, when their wishes have been unmistakably expressed, they should be looked upon as instructions.

The "Suffragist," the organ of the Congressional Union, is so impressed with these declarations that it insists that it is a mistake to "undertake referendums in States where it is generally believed that such referendums can have only unsuccessful conclusions." And this because "Not only do such campaigns dissipate strength, but, as this debate and vote has indicated, they erect further barriers against the passage of the national amendment."

Probably if the "Suffragist" could have had its way, the suffrage campaigns this year in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts,—in all of which states it is reasonably certain that the suffrage amendments will be defeated—would never have been undertaken.

But the obvious lesson to anti-suffragists is to make the suffrage defeats as overwhelming as possible. Then, if the question of a Federal amendment is brought before the next Congress, there will be 103 Representatives from these four states who will feel themselves under instructions from home to vote against it.

A FLIPPANT VIEW OF THE BALLOT

A YEAR or two ago, Massachusetts suffragists distributed flyers affirming that voting was merely something "that could be done on the way to market." Miss Helen Todd of California, said, in a speech at Austin, Texas, last January:

"Fifteen minutes is enough for a woman to vote. Surely a man shouldn't begrudge a woman fifteen minutes a year in which to put a piece of paper in a box telling what kind of a world she wants and what kind of people she wants to run it."

What sort of an uplift are we likely to have in politics, and what public benefits in legislation, through the agency of women who think that fifteen minutes a year is enough to devote to public affairs? The kind of ballot with which women in Miss Todd's own state have to cope is indicated in the following letter from one of them, written from Pasadena last November:

I am sending you by mail a ballot that the voters of California are going to use tomorrow. It will certainly appeal to your sense of humor. It does to mine. Your door bell rings constantly, and you find some zealous person urging you to vote "no" on 36, or "yes" on 27, etc. You rush madly, and look up the aforesaid amendments. The streets are filled with automobiles urging people to vote for one amendment or another.

And it is the ballot overloaded with these proposed changes in the fundamental law of the state to which Miss Todd proposes to devote fifteen minutes a year.

SUFFRAGISTS are not pointing with special pride to Nevada now-a-days. Nevada is not only one of the two "wettest" states in the Union, but its Legislature has just re-enacted the loosest divorce law anywhere existing. Nevada women are not responsible for either of these facts, but they go to show the ideals which prevail in a state which has just "enfranchised" its women.

FUTILE COUNSEL

THE BOSTON AMERICAN urges upon suffragists, as "a point that will make universal suffrage for women come quickly," the following:

"The number of Congressmen should depend upon the number of voters. Where the women vote, the number of Congressmen from the state should be doubled.

Once let it be understood that the states like Illinois, California, and others honest and intelligent enough to give women the vote will double their membership in Congress and the other states will quickly fall in line. If fifty thousand men voters are entitled to one Congressman then a hundred thousand men and women voters are entitled to two Congressmen. The state of Illinois having doubled the number of its voters should double the number of its Congressmen."

All this, and more to the same effect, in capital letters and heavy-face type.

The American is mistaken, in the first place, in supposing that Illinois has "doubled the number of its voters" so far as the election of Congressmen is concerned. Illinois women cannot vote for Congressmen. The idea that Illinois should "double the number of its Congressmen" because it allows women to vote for presidential electors, municipal officers, and candidates for other "statutory offices" is rather novel.

But the American is apparently ignorant regarding another and more fundamental consideration, namely, that the scheme which it urges should be "pushed through, as it can and must be" is one that cannot be achieved short of an amendment to the Federal Constitution. That Constitution provides that "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state."

To suppose that the male suffrage states, now numbering more than three fourths of the whole, would tumble over each other to join in so amending the Federal Constitution as to increase the representation of the suffrage states is preposterous. The American should give more rational counsel to its suffragist friends if it wants to be taken seriously.

A TENDER TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

IF the organizers of the association which calls itself the National Woman's Peace Party, of whom Miss Jane Addams was the leader, had had the promotion of peace as their chief object, they would have made the basis of the organization as broad as possible, in order that women of widely varying views upon all other questions might come together in a sincere effort to further the interests of peace.

Instead of this, they deliberately made the new organization a mere tender to the woman suffrage movement. They inserted in the platform a formal declaration for "the further humanizing of governments by the extension of the suffrage to women."

When this matter was brought up at the meeting held in Boston in January for the formation of a state branch of the new organization, and the propriety of the suffrage declaration was questioned, Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald, one of the most active suffrage organizers in the state, explained that women of all types of belief were to work together for peace, and that to change the platform "might complicate matters in an undesirable way."

But, if women of all types are to work together in the new association, why bind the association to a declaration for "the humanizing of governments by the extension of the suffrage to women?" Why, indeed, unless the prime purpose of the organizers of the so-called National Woman's Peace Party was to promote woman suffrage, and the furtherance of international peace was quite a secondary matter?

If the organizers of the new association are sincere, they will strike out the partisan declaration from their platform. If they do not do so, women who do not believe in woman suffrage should be wary about identifying themselves with an organization whose real purpose is thus disclosed.

HOW ABOUT THE SALOON INFLUENCE?

LAST November's elections have a bearing upon the familiar suffrage accusation that anti-suffragists are in league with the saloons. It is at least hard to reconcile with that accusation the fact that the two states which were carried for suffrage are the "wettest" states in the Union.

In Montana, according to the Anti-Saloon League Year Book for 1914, out of a population of 376,053, only 15,000 were in no-license territory. In Nevada, out of a population of 81,875, only 8,000 were in no-license territory. Expressed in percentages, only 4 per cent. of the Montana population and 9 per cent. of that of Nevada were in "dry" territory. But in Ohio 48 per cent., in Missouri 37 per cent., in Nebraska 56 per cent., in North Dakota 100 per cent., and in South Dakota 68 per cent. of the population were in "dry" territory.

In Montana, the only dry territory at the present time consists of Indian reservations, where the sale of liquor is forbidden by Federal law. Nevada has more retail liquor establishments in proportion to the population than any other state in the Union.

In Nebraska, Omaha, the seat of the brewing interests, voted against suffrage by only a small majority, while Fremont, a wet city, voted for it. A number of dry counties voted against it. In Ohio, we have the admission of Mrs. Upton, President of the State Suffrage Association, that the "drys" did not generally vote for suffrage.

If Montana and Nevada had voted against suffrage, we should have been told that it was the liquor interests that brought the result about. It seems fair to conclude that the saloons, in the two wettest states in the Union, felt that they had nothing to fear from women's vote.

EXPLOITING VICE FOR THE SUFFRAGE CAUSE

MASSACHUSETTS suffragists are using extensively, as one of their speakers in this campaign, as the Ohio suffragists did last year, Rose Livingston of New York, sometimes described as "the angel of Chinatown," who has become widely known for her courageous and often successful efforts to rescue girls from the opium dens of the metropolis. The stories which she tells are touching, and make a strong appeal to the sympathies of her hearers. Her value to the suffragists lies in the fact that she links her experiences in combatting the social evil with arguments for woman suffrage, on the ground that, with women voting, the conditions which she deplores would disappear.

No one would impugn her sincerity, or disparage the work which she is attempting to do. But it may be permitted to question her judgment; and it certainly is permissible to question the motives of the suffragists in using her as they are doing in this campaign.

If Miss Livingston's reasoning were well grounded, it would follow that such conditions as she describes would be practically non-existent in suffrage states. But no one knows better than the suffragists who employ her that the Chinese quarter of San Francisco furnishes horrors quite as tragic as Chinatown in New York; and that no city in the country of equal size has a worse reputation for immorality than Denver. Yet these are cities in suffrage states, and women's votes have not changed these conditions. It is to be noticed also, in this connection, that Wyoming, which has had suffrage for 46 years, and Colorado, which has had it for 22 years, rank lower, in the chart prepared by the American Vigilance Association to show the relative value of state laws for the protection of women, than Massachusetts, or New York or Pennsylvania,—states in which the suffragists are now campaigning for votes. This fact certainly has a bearing upon the present exploiting of vice.

Another fact is to be borne in mind. The young women who are found when Chinese opium dens are raided in most instances have not been taken there by violence. They have gone there voluntarily. Whether that is the first step in their ruin, or a later step does not affect the fact. And the causes which lie back of this moral tragedy are not causes which are due to defective legislation but to the absence of home training and restraint. One may see, any evening, in certain quarters of any city of considerable size, groups of girls, thoughtless, noisy, laughing and provocative, who offer tempting opportunities for unscrupulous men.

Well-intentioned curfew laws, and the efforts of the police to round up such groups and get them to their homes at a reasonably early hour, may do something to mitigate this evil; but they cannot take the place of home training. We hear a great deal about the need of the "mothering" influence in legislation. But there is no place where the mothering influence is more needed today or where it would be more effective than in the homes from which these girls come. There is a good deal to be said in extenuation of their behavior. They come from crowded tenements. They have no normal outlets for the natural instincts and exuberance of youth. They have little knowledge, until tragic experience has taught them, of the perils about them. They are in the cheap theatres, and the moving picture shows, or the dance halls, or on the streets because they have nowhere else to go.

The responsibility for these conditions is primarily woman's responsibility, because the normal woman is primarily the guardian of the home and the children. The way to relief does not lie in reaching out for the unnecessary responsibilities of political activity, but in intelligent, sympathetic and self-sacrificing work to make the home conditions better. If the energy expended by the suffragists in capitalizing these tragedies for the benefit of their cause were devoted to providing decent places of amusement for these girls, to guiding and encouraging their almost hopeless mothers in their education and restraint, and to extending the work of the settlement houses and kindred organizations, conditions would be improved in a way and to an extent impossible through legislation or any form of political activity.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND WOMAN'S RIGHTS

(Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge in The Annals of the American Academy)

THE right to vote carries with it a moral responsibility of exercising the franchise; therefore the majority of women who do not believe in woman suffrage have the right to protest against this obligation.

The life of the average woman is not so ordered as to give her first hand knowledge of those things which are the essentials of sound government. Clean streets and pure milk are sure to come as the knowledge of sanitary living increases. Tariff reform, fiscal policies, international relations, those large endeavors which men now determine, are foreign to the concerns and pursuits of the average woman. She is worthily employed in other departments of life, and the vote will not help her to fulfil her obligations therein.

The exceptional woman, who by some combination of circumstances is released from these obligations of the average woman, is today rendering public service which is distinctive because it is removed from personal, political ambitions. She has the right to serve the state, and serves well in proportion to her freedom from party strife; she does not divert her efforts for the solution of social problems to the machinery of political organization. Herein lies the exceptional woman's distinctive contribution, not as a politician but as a disinterested factor working to render public service uncolored by political motives. Our exceptional American women are rapidly entering the ranks of those who thus serve the state.

It is woman's right to be exempt from political responsibility in order that she may be free to render her best service to the state. The state has surrounded her with protective legislation in order that she may attain her highest efficiency in those departments of the world's work for which her nature and her training fit her.

IS IT WORTH WHILE?

(From The New York Times, Feb. 7, 1915).

THE voter must help to decide the gravest public questions relating to labor, international disputes, measures of national defense, race problems, public morality, monetary plans, tariffs, and taxation. On such questions men vote according to judgments founded on observation and knowledge acquired in the pursuit of their daily business. Women would inevitably attempt to decide such matters empirically or emotionally.

But, say the suffragists, women as well as men may equip themselves for the intelligent use of the ballot. Individual women may and do, the mass of women will not and cannot, save by spending their lives in the hard school where men learn how to vote. If women are to forsake the home for the counting room, the law office, the wheat fields, and the smithy, then indeed, barring temperamental differences that only the hand of God can efface, they may in time be able to cast a ballot which they can explain and justify by reasons which men can understand. Is it worth while? Let the agitators for woman suffrage answer that one question. Is it worth while to subvert the whole order of society by putting women to do men's work? Is it worth while to take woman out of the school where she fits herself for her high natural duties to put her under a tuition against which her body and mind and soul would be in perpetual revolt? Of course, the most fanatical advocate of votes for women would never preach a doctrine so monstrous. Yet that is the only way. Either women must work as men work, or they will never be qualified to vote as men vote.

WHY ARE NOT WOMEN MAKING THE LAWS?

(From the New York Evening Post, Mar. 1, 1915.)

To the Editor of the Evening Post:

Sir—The suffragists insist that better legislation will certainly follow the giving of the ballot to women.

Men, they say, are careless of the interests of women and children. They are indifferent to child labor. They do not think anything about sanitation, or food adulteration, or pure milk, or factory regulation, or the social evil, or dozens of other things which women have at heart. Give women the ballot, it is said, and all these things will be taken care of by the "mothering" influence of women.

But if all this is true, why is it that the suffrage States have not found it out? Why are they not giving women some conspicuous share in the work of law-making?

Here is Wyoming, which has had woman suffrage for 46 years. Are women numerous in the Wyoming Legislature? Hardly. There is not a single woman among the 27 Senators, and only one among the 57 members of the House.

Here is Colorado, which has had woman suffrage for 22 years. Helen Ring Robinson, who was extensively advertised by the suffragists last year as the only woman who had ever been elected a State Senator, is still the only Senator in the Colorado Senate, and there is only one woman in the House.

California teems with new ideas and gives its voters a ballot four feet long, loaded with referendum proposals and constitutional amendments. But all of the 120 members of its Legislature are mere men.

The same thing is true of the 165 members of the Kansas Legislature.

Even in Utah, where women were given the ballot in order to strengthen the Mormon church, there are no women in the Senate and only two in the House.

Altogether, an examination of the official lists of members of the Legislatures in the nine States where women were voting last November shows a singular indifference to the value of women law-makers. Here are the figures:

	Members of Legislature.	Women members.
Arizona	54	2
California	120	0
Colorado	100	2
Idaho	94	1
Kansas	165	0
Oregon	90	2
Utah	33	2
Washington . . .	138	0
Wyoming	84	1
	908	10

In view of the fact that but a trifle more than 1 per cent of the legislative membership in the suffrage States is composed of women, what becomes of the suffrage argument of the need of "mothering influence" in law-making?

Frank Foxcroft.

Cambridge, Mass.

"WHILE THE GRABBING IS GOOD"

(From the Boston Advertiser, Mar. 10, 1915)

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

A suffragist correspondent of The Advertiser, commenting on my recent letter regarding the striking absence of the "mothering influence" from the legislatures of the suffrage states, thanks me for the letter and invites me to "come again." The reason for the gratitude and for the invitation, neither of which, I fear, is serious, is that my letter "bore out one of the strongest of suffrage contentions,—namely, that woman is not an office seeker."

If you will kindly allow me, however, to "come again," I should like to present a bit of evidence bearing upon this point.

In an interview in the Chicago Record-Herald of July 13, 1913, Mrs. Harriet G. R. Wright, one of the first women legislators elected in Colorado, and President for years of the Colorado Equal Suffrage Association advised the Illinois women to "grab everything that is offered while the grabbing is good." She deplored the fact that the Colorado women had made the mistake, at the beginning, of not being more insistent upon offices, with the result that now they had to fight for every single concession; and she added: "Let the Illinois women be advised, and insist on recognition in the partition of offices from the start. Else they will find themselves spending a weary time later trying to get the least of offices."

It would appear from this that the presence of only two women in this year's Colorado legislature was not due to diffidence on the part of the suffragists. And the extravagant demonstrations made by the suffragists last year over Helen Ring Robinson as the first woman to be anywhere elected State Senator point in the same direction. Also, the number of women candidates for alderman who were put in the field in Chicago last year suggests a readiness on the part of Chicago women to accept Mrs. Wright's advice; and the fact that all of them were defeated does not suggest self-abnegation on the part of the women, but a callous indifference to "mothering influence" on the part of the voters.

Frank Foxcroft.

Cambridge, March 8, 1915.

WOOING THE SALOON INTERESTS

WHILE most of the suffrage orators try to convince the people that woman suffrage would bring about a "moral uplift," and especially that it would strengthen the forces of temperance, Miss Margaret Foley seems to have been told off to reassure the saloon interests and to persuade them that they have nothing to fear from women's votes.

This was the tenor of her street-corner talks in New Bedford, Gloucester and other cities last summer, when she told the men who gathered to listen to her that "no one was going to take away their beer." It was the main theme in her campaign in Nevada; and she evidently succeeded in persuading the voters that suffrage had no connection with prohibition, else the state which has more saloons in proportion to the population and more people living in wet territory in proportion than any other state in the Union would hardly have cast its vote for woman suffrage.

Of late, Miss Foley has been busy trying to ward off possibly hostile action on the part of labor unions which might feel themselves endangered by any possible alliance between suffrage and prohibition. The Worcester Gazette of December 3d, 1914, reported her as appearing the night before at a meeting of the Central Labor Union, to reassure the members of the Bottlers' Union upon this point. Since then, this particular phase of the question seems to have been pressed with energy. The Worcester Telegram of March 11 says:

The antipathy of the delegates representing the unions engaged in the liquor business was based on a fear that woman suffrage will mean prohibition, and will deprive many of the livelihood that they are now making. Practically every speaker who has appeared before the delegates has declared that there is no relation between woman suffrage and prohibition. As Margaret Foley, Mrs. Joseph Fels and other ardent suffragists who have appeared before the unions have explained, the attitude of women on prohibition varies with them as it does with men.

The Woman's Journal, the other day, printed an absurd report, from some source which it did not care to name, that the liquor interests in this state were raising eight million dollars to defeat the suffrage amendment. If the amendment is defeated, as it pretty certainly will be, the Journal will be sure to attribute the defeat to the saloons. This was what was done in Wisconsin, although there the wooing of the liquor interests went on more openly than thus far in this state, and the immediate leader of the suffrage campaign afterward frankly testified that so far as she knew, the brewers had kept their word. It was what was done in Michigan, although all the counties which voted "dry" voted also against suffrage. So we may expect the same misstatements here. But meanwhile, when the suffrage leaders, to gain votes, promise directly opposite results to conflicting interests, their facing-both-ways policy cannot escape the criticism which it deserves.

WASHINGTON AND ITS DEATH RATE

WRITING in the Worcester Gazette of Jan. 15, 1915, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell called attention to the fact that "The State of Washington, where women vote, has the lowest death rate in the Union."

With this as a text, suffrage speakers and writers have since been busy expounding and emphasizing the benefits which woman suffrage confers upon a state. The Equal Suffrage Department of the Lynn Political Science Club, in the Lynn Item for Feb. 25, put the matter in this way:

"It is significant that a suffrage state leads the whole procession in the important matter of health. If women neglected their homes and ceased to cook good, nourishing meals for their husbands, the death rate among men would go up. If 'the burden of the ballot' wrecked women's health and nerves the death rate among women would go up. If it led mothers to neglect their children, infant mortality would increase. This census report seems to furnish a complete disproof of the main predictions of disaster made in regard to equal suffrage."

Now, it is quite true, as Miss Blackwell stated, that Washington has the lowest death rate of any state in the Union. But it is also true, as Miss Blackwell omitted to state, that Washington held this proud position *before woman suffrage was granted*. To cite this as evidence of the beneficent workings of woman suffrage is therefore disingenuous, to say the least. And to point to it, as the Lynn suffragist does, as "complete disproof" of all the disasters apprehended from suffrage is rather more than disingenuous.

It was in 1910 that Washington became a suffrage state. But the census of that year showed it with the lowest death rate in the Union. It has held that position since. The rate dropped a little in 1911, and again in 1912, and rose a little in 1913, the last year for which statistics are available; but no one, probably, would be so fatuous as to attribute these fluctuations to woman suffrage.

MUST END IN DISASTER

(From the Boston Pilot, Jan. 9, 1915)

THE Christian woman in her home has unlimited power and her influence for good cannot be over-estimated. All the charms and virtues with which Christianity has endowed her point to her exalted position as man's refining and spiritualizing influence. Men may make the country's laws, but she can influence men's morals for good or for evil, and so true is this that the moral condition of society may be taken as an index of the virtues of its women and of the respect given them by its men.

Whatever, then, may be the outcome of the present movement for woman's emancipation, this assertion cannot be challenged. Any attempt to force woman from her natural sphere of activity to place her in rivalry with man in the rude business of life can end only in disaster. Twenty centuries of civilization have surrounded her with charms which are the secret of her dignity and her power. Any attack upon these endowments must end eventually in the return of the Amazon to assume the place now held by Christian womanhood.

THE FIGURES OF WOMEN'S VOTE

IT is a familiar saying that "figures cannot lie"; but, when skilfully manipulated, they can at least be made to prevaricate.

An illustration of this truth is to be found in a manifesto recently published by the officers of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, intended to show that, instead of being "a vanishing quantity" the woman school voter in Massachusetts "is much more in evidence than she used to be." To sustain such a proposition as this, the figures need to be carefully selected. The method followed is to give first the very light vote in the first year when women had the school ballot; then the average during the twenty years from 1890 to 1910; and then the totals for 1911, 1912 and 1913. The figure for the first year is "about 5,000"; the average for the twenty-year period is 15,600; the figures for 1911, 1912 and 1913 are 22,755, 48,127 and 44,503 respectively.

Several significant facts are entirely omitted in this comparative statement. One is that the number of women of voting age in Massachusetts is 1,074,485; and that, in the years of the largest vote, only about 4 per cent. of these voted. Another is that, in 1911, there were 175 towns, and in 1912 there were 159 towns in which not a single woman voted; and there were 96 towns in 1911 and 88 in 1912 in which the number of women's votes ranged from 1 to 10.

Another fact which escapes notice in the manifesto is that the increase in 1911 and again in 1912 was not due to any general increase of interest, but to exciting local contests in three or four cities. In 1911, the women's vote in Fall River and Lowell alone, under the stimulus of these contests, increased by 7,074, which was 99 per cent. of the state-wide increase for that year. In 1912, by reason of similar contests, the women's vote in four cities,—Fall River, Lowell, Brockton and Cambridge—suddenly increased by 26,972, which accounts for 87 per cent. of the total increase for that year. In Cambridge alone, the women's vote rose from 56 in 1911 to 5,394 in 1912. The suffragists are welcome to whatever consolation they can find in these violent and fleeting spasms of interest, due usually to causes which few people regard as conducive to the public welfare. It was because of a subsidence of these contests that the women's vote dropped again in 1913.

It is rather diverting to find the suffrage manifesto "pointing with pride" to women's school vote in Boston. The paragraph relating to Boston is worth quoting in full:

"In Boston, the women's vote at the election just past was 3,949. This was an increase of about 900 over their vote at the previous election, 3,086. It was more than quadruple the average vote cast by Boston women at the first nine elections after they obtained the school ballot, which was only 991."

But why go back more than thirty years for a comparison? Why not state frankly that the two votes above quoted were the smallest for thirty years? That they were less than one third as large as that cast in 1903? And that they represented less than 2 per cent. of the women of voting age? These are facts of real significance; and if the suffrage manifesto had been concerned to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, it would scarcely have ignored them.

SUFFRAGE AND THE MORMONS

THE issue of the Woman's Journal for January 30 might almost be described as a pro-Mormon Number. At least, the whole editorial page, and no less than six editorial articles, all signed by the familiar editorial initials, are devoted to a defence and extenuation of conditions in Utah.

The first article opens with the statement that "the majority of women in the world live where polygamy is an institution,"—namely, in India and China; and that "the vast bulk of the world's polygamy exists in countries where women have not the ballot." But the inference that, if they had the ballot, polygamy would be done away is not insisted on, possibly because of the obvious fact that they have the ballot in Utah and the other states where the Mormon church is strongest.

Another article quotes Mrs. Julia Ward Howe as saying that "the only fault found with" women voters in Utah "is that the Mormon women vote as the church advises"; and this is extenuated on the ground that "the Mormon men do exactly the same thing."

A third article argues that polygamy was not invented by women but by men, and that the Mormon priesthood is "a male hierarchy, without a woman in it." A fourth gravely insists that "Nothing is more certain than that the women of the United States in general would vote against polygamy." The same thing is equally true of men in general, but that is beside the point. A fifth article holds up the legislation of Utah as a model for other states; and a sixth affirms that elections in Utah are more orderly than they were before women voted.

But, somehow, this pro-Utah broadside, labored as it is, leaves untouched the fact that Utah women were given the ballot to strengthen the Mormon church, and that they vote, as Mrs. Howe admitted, "as the church advises."

THE proposed suffrage amendment to the Michigan Constitution having been defeated at the polls two years ago by a majority of 96,144, the suffragists attempted this year to get a bill through the Legislature modeled upon the Illinois law. But the attempt had to be abandoned because the Constitution of Michigan is so phrased as not to admit of such tinkering. The Detroit Free-Press voices a widespread indignation at this attempt to subvert the expressed will of the people.

MASSACHUSETTS suffragists should be wary of claiming that the State Grange is on their side. At its last annual meeting, the Grange deposited on the table a resolution favoring suffrage.

THE CHICAGO PRIMARY

CERTAIN facts stand out conspicuously in connection with the recent Chicago primary. As they are passed over in the suffragist comments upon the results, it seems worth while to set them down.

First, out of 516,292 women entitled to register and vote, only 218,712 registered; and, of these, only 154,750 voted.

Second, so far as the candidates for Mayor are concerned, the result would have been the same, if every woman had stayed at home. Sweitzer would have received the Democratic nomination, if only men had voted; and Thompson would have received the Republican nomination. Both were nominated as it was; and the fact that only a minority of the women voted for Thompson did not change the result.

Third, so far as the aldermanic candidates are concerned, The Woman's Journal is able to point out only one ward in which the women's vote affected the result.

Fourth, "Hinky Dink" Kennan went in triumphant for another term as alderman, as his pal, Bathhouse John, did last year. No political "uplift" here.

ANOTHER SUFFRAGE CLAIM EXPLODED

AMONG the claims which the suffragists have been making of late in statements circulated all over the country, and from hundreds of platforms, is that Chicago owes the adoption of improved methods of garbage disposal solely to women's votes.

The most responsible authority for these statements is Miss Jane Addams, who, in a speech in Boston, Sept. 17, 1914, said:

"Chicago had a very bad system of garbage disposal. The method was to haul it out to a poor quarter of the city, where the people are already uncomfortable and overcrowded, and there dump it and leave it to rot. Miss Mary McDowell, a settlement worker, had made a great effort to have this changed. She went to Europe and studied the best systems of garbage disposal; she had a striking set of slides made, illustrating the conditions, and got a chance to show them before the city fathers of Chicago. She lectured on the subject on all occasions. She tried her best for fifteen years. I tried too, and I served as garbage inspector of my ward at one time; but though we used our indirect influence to its utmost, nothing was done.

"Women were given the right to vote. Then the Mayor decided that we had an abominable system of garbage disposal. The city government appropriated $10,000 to improve it, and Miss McDowell, 'Chicago's great garbage expert,' as the Mayor called her, was appointed on the committee that was to spend the money. She was just the same kind of expert that she had been before; but now the women were voters."

A letter, asking for information upon this matter, was written by Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee of Boston to the Chicago Commissioner of Public Works, and a reply was received, under date of Feb. 2, 1915, from Dr. G. B. Young, Commissioner of Public Health, to whom the letter had been referred.

Dr. Young began by expressing surprise at the statements made in the newspaper clipping sent to him; and went on to make a detailed statement of the facts. From this it appears that the general system of hauling out garbage to be disposed of by dumps in the rural portions of the city was abandoned about ten years ago; and a contract was then made with private parties to dispose of the garbage by extracting the grease and other elements of value. But the garbage from certain places was still collected by private scavengers, and dumped in a number of places, creating a considerable nuisance, though none of the places were closely surrounded by dwellings.

Dr. Young stated that Miss McDowell for years did more than any one else to arouse interest in the question of a sanitary and inoffensive method of garbage disposal; but he added: "The suffrage question, so far as I can see, and I have been in very close touch with this matter for the last five years, had nothing whatever to do with the arrangement as finally made."

This is clear from a consideration of the dates. It was not until May, 1913, that the suffrage bill was lobbied through the Illinois legislature. But it was in the early spring of 1912 that a commission was appointed by the city to consider better methods of garbage disposal, and the recommendations of this commission, made in May, 1912, a whole year before the passage of the suffrage bill, were closely followed in the final settlement of the question. Definite action could not be taken in the matter until after the expiration of the garbage contract in October, 1913. In the meantime, a Waste Commission was appointed, of which Miss McDowell was a member, and Dr. Young was Secretary; the matter of emergency disposal was turned over to the Health Department; and the old plant was purchased, reconstructed, and operated by the Health Department to the general satisfaction. Dr. Young, writing, as he explains, "entirely apart from any position for or against the suffrage question, and solely in the interest of accuracy," goes on to say:

"The great majority of the preliminary work and negotiations which led up to the final solution of the difficulty, occurred before we had female suffrage in Illinois; and, while there is no question that Miss McDowell and Mrs. Owen who was associated with her on the Waste Commission did very valuable work in arousing public opinion on the subject of the necessity for securing a sanitary and inoffensive method of garbage disposal, Miss McDowell probably doing more than any one individual in the city to arouse interest in the matter, the effect of her agitation of the matter was produced by arousing the general interest of the public, and not by the involvement of any interest in suffrage."

From this it would appear that Miss McDowell's most effective work in this matter had nothing to do with woman suffrage, but was done through that indirect influence which anti-suffragists prize so highly, and which suffragists treat with scorn.

NOTES

MRS. SNOWDEN said recently: "Heaven will soon have no charms for women. They would sooner go to New Zealand." But this remark was made before New Zealand, that suffrage Arcadia, went "wet."

THE official statement of the Congressional Union shows that it spent $8,129.92 in its last year's campaign in the suffrage states against Democratic Congressmen. It must wish that it had the money back, for it has nothing whatever to show for it.

THE suffragists seem to know no limits in their misstatements of fact. In the suffrage column of the Lynn News for Feb. 17, it is said: "Four million and a half women can now vote." But the total female population of the eleven full-suffrage states, from babies-in-arms up, is only 3,634,778.

EMMA GOLDMAN is often referred to by the suffragists as an anti-suffragist. But, in an interview in the Boston Journal of Jan. 29 she said: "When interviewers said I am opposed to woman suffrage, they forgot to mention that I am opposed to suffrage for men." But she added: "As long as any ballot exists, the women should have it as well as the men."

THERE is little to encourage the suffragists in the vote on the suffrage amendment in the National House of Representatives last January. The vote stood: 174 in favor to 204 against, with 57 Representatives not recorded. In a full House, the suffragists would have needed 290 votes to carry the amendment. They fell 116 short of that. On the vote recorded, they needed 252 supporters. They fell 78 short of that.

APROPOS of the suffrage claim that, if European women had had the vote, there would have been no war, and that the influence of women can always be counted on the side of peace, it is interesting to know that the great Krupp gun works are jointly owned by Bertha and Barbara Krupp, that the actual management of the works is in the hands of Bertha Krupp, and that it was the guns called the "Busy Berthas" that destroyed Liege, and ruined the cathedral of Rheims.

IT is interesting to notice that Illinois is one of the states in which the suffragists are making no effort to secure the adoption of a suffrage amendment. This is not because they would not like to have the right to vote for Governor, for members of the Legislature, for Representatives in Congress and for United States Senators,—none of which privileges they now enjoy—but because they are convinced that a suffrage amendment would be hopelessly beaten at the polls.

THE practical alliance between woman suffrage and the extremer forms of Socialism is a matter upon which the suffragists do not think it prudent to enlarge; but the Socialists have no scruples about it. Here is the New York Call, the Socialist organ, issuing this rallying cry: "The fight for woman suffrage in this state is bound to be a hard one, and on none does the responsibility for success fall more heavily than upon the Socialists. The time for the Socialists to begin this great campaign to which they are pledged is now."

Now, the suffragists are pointing to the fact that the total vote in California for President in 1912 was only 673,527, while the vote for Governor in 1914 was 926,754, as proof of the increasing interest of women in the ballot. But Mrs. Porritt, who uses this argument in the Bridgeport Farmer and other Connecticut papers, should know that the real explanation of the figures is quite different. In 1912, the Republican Presidential electors were crowded off the ballot, and the Republican vote dropped in consequence to 3,914. But in 1914, under normal conditions, the Republican vote was 271,990. This difference more than accounts for the whole increase.

UNNECESSARY AND INEXPEDIENT

MINNESOTA women opposed to woman suffrage urged the legislature of that state to refuse to submit a suffrage amendment to the voters until the women should have had an opportunity, through a referendum, to declare whether a majority of them desired it. In a formal protest to the legislature, they argued that woman suffrage was unnecessary and inexpedient, for these reasons:

It is unnecessary, first, because the laws which in the past discriminated against women have been so changed that legal advantage is nearly always on the side of the women. These changes have been effected without woman suffrage, although woman's influence has played a large part in bringing them about. Moreover, the laws relating especially to women and children are already better in non-suffrage states than in suffrage states.

It is unnecessary, secondly, because what we need in the ballot is not greater quantity, but improved quality. We believe that some women would be better voters than some men, but that the total vote of women would show about the same degree of judgment and conscience as that of men; and we see no reason for doubling the vote unless we can also purify and improve it.

Woman suffrage is inexpedient, because her present influence, in many cases very considerable, would be impaired if it became a political influence. It is inexpedient because it sets two people to do the work of one; because the basis of government is force, and women should not be set to making laws which they cannot enforce; and because women, so far as tested, do not use the vote in great or increasing numbers where it has been granted.

NOT FAIR TO WOMEN

(Right Rev. Daniel Sylvester Tuttle, Episcopal Bishop of Missouri and Presiding Episcopal Bishop of the United States)

IT is not fair to women to give them the ballot. Already women are doing more than half of the world's work. It is said that suffrage would eliminate many of the social evils. That remains to be seen. Many of the women who would vote are degraded women, who could be influenced by prejudice and money, and it seems to me there would be merely an addition to the corrupt vote.